

**DRAFT**  
**Minutes of the Regular Planning Board Meeting**  
**Monday, September 24, 2007**

1. CONVENE: 7:06 p.m.
2. FLAG SALUTE: Vice President Kohlstrand
3. ROLL CALL: President Cook, Vice President Kohlstrand, Ezzy Ashcraft, Lynch, Mariani and McNamara.

Board member Cunningham was absent.

Also present were Planning Services Manager Andrew Thomas, Assistant City Attorney Donna Mooney, Obaid Khan, Public Works.

4. MINUTES:
  - a. Minutes for the meeting of September 10, 2007.

President Cook noted that page 2, paragraph 6, should be changed to read, “President Cook noted that she was concerned *about delaying with the October 22* Measure A subcommittee report *until October 22.*”

President Cook noted that page 5, paragraph 2, should be changed to read, “President Cook recommended that the Planning Board *make bringing the City’s plans and ordinances take action to bring* into compliance *with into* State law as the top priority. She suggested that, *if necessary*, additional resources could be requested from City Council to fulfill that priority.”

President Cook noted that page 8, third paragraph from the bottom, should be changed to read, “President Cook noted that the Board members only had three dots, and that did not indicate lack of interest *in other planning projects.*”

President Cook noted that page 9, paragraph 2, should be changed to read, “She requested copies of the quarterly reports, and recalled that there were many important concepts in the Vision Plan *that are probably still relevant.*”

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft moved approval of the Minutes for September 10, 2007, as amended.

Board member McNamara seconded the motion, with the following voice vote – 6. Absent: 1 (Cunningham). The motion passed.

5. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION

President Cook proposed hearing Item 9-B before Item 9-A in the interest of the applicant's priorities.

6. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

a. Future Agendas

Mr. Thomas provided an update on future agenda items.

Member Lynch noted that within the last six months, the Board has met with the City Council in a joint meeting, and had numerous discussions regarding the efforts that the individual members bring to bear, as well as the intent of the Planning Board. He noted that Alameda Point was the largest land use issue within the Planning Board's purview, and inquired why the development team would not discuss their philosophies before the Board. He noted that a number of people have commented on the parking garage, and noted that it was interesting to hear the reactions on the visual aspect of the parking garage although they were in support of the concept. He noted that it had become a point of contention over the past few years. It appeared to him that with respect to Alameda Point, that a bifurcated system had been developed. He believed the land use issue should be discussed with the Planning Board as well.

Mr. Thomas noted that staff wanted the developers to come before the Board to lay out their proposed schedule and approach to the planning for Alameda Point, in order to review it with the Planning Board first. He noted that they had signed an agreement with City Council affirming that they would have the entire process completed in two years, meaning that the bulk of the planning effort must be done in the next eight months. He believed the primary question was how the Planning Board wanted to participate in this process.

Member Lynch believed there were some inconsistencies between what he had heard, and the scheduled meetings on October 8, November 14, and December 12. He identified the inconsistencies between a heightened appeal from the community that they want to weigh in earlier in the process, and that they prefer to approach the project in small bites.

Mr. Thomas noted that Member Lynch's comments were well taken, and would pass them on to the developers.

President Cook requested that they hold the October 23 meeting during the October 22 Planning Board meeting, so that it would be televised for greater public exposure.

Member Ezzy Ashcraft supported President Cook's suggestion.

b. Zoning Administrator Report

Mr. Thomas provided the Zoning Administrator report.

7. ORAL COMMUNICATION: None.

8. CONSENT CALENDAR: None.

8-A **Development Agreement DA89-1 -- Harbor Bay Business Park Association, Harbor Bay Isle Associates and Harbor Bay Entities -- Bay Farm Island (Primarily Harbor Bay Isle).** A request for a Periodic Review of Development Agreement DA89-01, for the period through April 4, 2007, as required under Zoning Ordinance Section 30-95.1.

Member Ezzy Ashcraft moved to adopt the Planning Board Resolution to accept the Periodic Review of Development Agreement DA89-01, for the period through April 4, 2007, as required under Zoning Ordinance Section 30-95.1.

Member McNamara seconded the motion, with the following voice vote – 6. Absent: 1 (Cunningham). The motion passed.

9. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

9-B. **Alameda Landing Waterfront Promenade, Master Landscape Plan and Development Agreement Amendment, Project Applicant: Catellus Development Group, an affiliate of Palmtree Acquisitions Corporation.** The applicant requests a Waterfront Development Plan amendment, a Master Landscape Plan amendment, and a Development Agreement amendment to revise the design of the proposed waterfront promenade and open space proposed as part of the Alameda Landing Project. The site is located along the western end of the former FISC Site (Tract 7884) within the M-X Mixed Use Planned Development Zoning District. (AT)

Mr. Thomas presented the staff report. and recommended approval of this item.

Mr. Aidan Berry, applicant, introduced the project team and concept.

Ms. Altschuler, SMWM, displayed a PowerPoint presentation and described the details of the approach and solutions of the project. She described the landscape plan in detail, as well as shoreline access and planting.

Vice President Kohlstrand noted that in pulling back the promenade, one of the office buildings was being cut off. She inquired whether the square footage of office was being reduced, or whether stories would be added to the office building.

Mr. Thomas stated that the entitlement for office use was 400,000 square feet per the Master Plan, and added that the changes in the promenade would not change the amount of square footage of allowed office use. The old plan anticipated that the second warehouse would be retained; under the new plan, it would not be retained, and a new office building would be included, with half the footprint of the old building. The additional square footage would be gained by going up. He clarified that the approval of the development plan for the promenade was an approval of the open space concept, but

was not an endorsement of a particular footprint. Both buildings will be subject to a future development plan and design review application to be reviewed by the Planning Board.

President Cook noted that the siting of the buildings were originally set in place because the City wanted to retain the warehouse structures. She inquired whether the Planning Board would have the ability to review the two westernmost new buildings and reconsider their siting.

Mr. Thomas replied that it would be possible, and noted that the Clif Bar building and shed were both already approved, and the location was set. The location of every other building on this site plan was still subject to the Planning Board's review and approval through the development plan and design review.

Ms. Altschuler added that the revised plan showed a continuous access along the area, which allowed the Bay Trail to come straight into the site, eliminating the previous jog around several buildings.

In response to an inquiry by Board member Ezzy Ashcraft regarding keeping pedestrians safe from the bicyclists, Ms. Altschuler replied that a 12-foot minimum area was required on most of the Bay Trail, and that there would be sufficient room with 44 feet to accommodate both uses safely. She added that benches would be added to invite pedestrians to stop and rest on the trail.

The public hearing was opened.

Mr. Christopher Buckley noted that he submitted a letter to the Planning Board, and spoke in support of retaining the second warehouse. He believed one of the more compelling features of the original project was maintaining the look of a working waterfront; he believed that the generous length of the two warehouse structures provided that look. He believed that removing the second warehouse reduced the original visual context for the working waterfront, and he did not believe it would provide the sense of place provided by the original concept. He requested clarification of the statement in the staff report that suggested the possibility that the remaining warehouse may need to be removed, that the proposed amendments will define and clarify where a new building would need to be placed if a decision is made in the future to demolish the existing waterfront would have as currently planned for Clif Bar. He inquired whether the Planning Board would be asked to preliminarily endorse the idea of removing the Clif Bar warehouse, and replacing it with a new structure. He suggested using a lighter-weight, more cost-effective planking for the section of wharf over the pilings, such as the wood plankings shown in the illustrations on top of the existing pilings. He believed it was necessary to resolve these issues so that Clif Bar may move ahead on schedule, and suggested that if the City would like to study the options concerning the second warehouse, that the Clif Bar phase to move ahead at the same time.

Mr. Gary Erickson, owner, Clif Bar, noted that he co-owned the company with his wife, Kit Crawford, and added that they were very excited to move to Alameda. He complimented the quality of the plans, and noted that they had been set back when they discovered the wharf issue. He noted that they had been working closely with Catellus and Prologis, and were very pleased with the redesign. He requested that the Planning Board approve this item as soon as possible.

Mr. Bill Smith expressed concern about air quality on this site, and would like to see a diversion of the airflow at the turnaround basin.

Mr. Richard Rutter believed the previous plan was very good, and retained the monumental scale of the warehouses and pier structure. He believed that the site was diminished with the removal of one of the warehouses. He noted that the piers were very heavily built, and recommended that the issue of the piers be reviewed, including cost estimates, to determine consensus on their retention.

Ms. Ann Rockwell, Alameda East Bay Miracle League, described the Miracle League's mission and noted that they hoped to be a part of this development. She hoped the field would be built within two to three years, and urged the Planning Board to support the project.

Ms. Karen Bey spoke in support of retaining the wharf. She agreed with Mr. Buckley's assessment that the Clif Bar component of the project move forward. She believed that the issue of cost-effectiveness should be a primary discussion with respect to keeping the wharf. She inquired whether the possibility of creating a community facility district had been explored to fund this part of the infrastructure.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

Mr. Thomas noted that the promenade would be improved and built by Catellus, and the maintenance of the public portions of the promenade would be maintained by the City; however, the cost for the maintenance would be generated by a Municipal Services District. He noted that all of Fifth Street, Mitchell Mosely Street and the basic public roads, the landscaping on the public roads and the promenade will be maintained through the District.

Mr. Thomas noted that with respect to the issue of demolishing the Clif Bar warehouse, the City originally understood that the wharf extended from the edge of the water back to just behind the Clif Bar building. Any new structures must be built at the back of the wharf. He noted that the entire embankment must be reinforced, which would slide horizontally in the event of an earthquake. He noted that the City had peer reviewed the studies, and that the City was in total agreement that there was a real problem with the embankment, which must be stabilized for the earthquake risk.

President Cook inquired whether different kinds of engineering solutions had been explored, such as a seismic joint to allow part of the pier to be free in an earthquake event.

Mr. Thomas noted that staff was continuing to look at a number of different ways to stabilize the situation, including different technologies. They were confident, based on the work done so far, that major changes will need to be made to the promenade plan to address those two issues. He noted that Clif Bar's issues should be addressed immediately, and a condition on Clif Bar is that everything would be built to the east of Clif Bar immediately.

Member Ezzy Ashcraft believed the Board concurred on moving the Clif Bar project forward. She believed Catellus must have an idea of the cost to do the seismic retrofit and reinforcement under the Clif Bar warehouse. She believed that would be useful if the second warehouse were to be preserved. If the equipment would be brought in to do the work on Clif Bar, it might be cost-effective to do both at the same time.

Member Lynch inquired what the City's role was in terms of providing peer review. Mr. Thomas replied that the City would peer review the studies and cost estimates, if they wished to share them. Ultimately, Catellus would decide whether it would move forward with the project.

Member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that she was surprised when she read the report because the Board had heard so many positive things about the project. She had assumed that they knew what was beneath the wharf. She inquired whether Catellus/Prologis was still waiting for any other test results or analyses of any of the other three phases of the project, or whether they anticipate that there will be others. She was very concerned about maintaining the relationship with Clif Bar, and believed that Alameda was very fortunate that Clif Bar wanted to do business in the City. She noted that the first amendment to the development agreement on page 5 (paragraph b), read, "In the event that the wharf building is demolished after creation of a reuse parcel..." She felt very strongly that that wharf building must be preserved for Clif Bar as long as Clif Bar is interested in being a player in this project. She suggested amending the language to read: "In the event that *Clif Bar elects not to occupy* the wharf building, *and the building* is demolished after creation of a reuse parcel..." She wanted to make it clear that that was not an option as long as Clif Bar was a part of this project.

Member Ezzy Ashcraft inquired whether the neighborhood LEED certification was still being pursued. She inquired whether the green space closer to the water would be grass or Bay-friendly landscaping. Ms. Altschuler replied that it would be a natural landscape element, and that grass would not be put in that location. She noted that it was called a transitional marsh area, and added that one of the slides displayed the mix of natural landscaping found around the Bay.

Member Ezzy Ashcraft commented on the possibility that the Miracle League portion of the project could take until the year 2016 to complete, and requested that if there was any way

to move that portion of the project done ahead of time so that the children could use it as soon as possible. She added that she was encouraged by the letter of September 12, which described the benefits of the revised plan, and included the biologist's observation that "overall, the project revisions will result in a net benefit to biological resources and waters of the San Francisco Bay because of existing hardscape at and over the edge of the Bay would be removed and replaced with a restored tidal marsh area, establishing a more natural landscape to the shoreline of the inner Oakland Harbor."

Member McNamara noted that Catellus was investigating the financial impact of these revisions, and believed that to split up the shoring up of the wharf, and possibly delaying the renovation of the area to the west, would not be a cost-effective solution for a developer. She did not see that as a feasible solution, and believed that the project should be examined in its entirety. She supported the changes proposed by Catellus, given the structural issues. She also liked the change that flattened the waterfront plaza, which enhances the use of the space. She liked the idea of a floating dock, which was a creative solution. She was concerned about maintenance of the water level landscaping, particularly with respect to accumulation of litter as the tide comes in.

Mr. Thomas noted that the maintenance would be performed by the City, but paid for by the project.

President Cook echoed Member McNamara's concern about the maintenance at the waterfront, and wanted to ensure that the responsibilities were clear.

Member Lynch was confident that the design elements had been vetted, and that he was comfortable with that. He believed it was an attractive project, and was not concerned with the viability of maintaining and shoring up the wharf area. He was confident that was vetted with the City as well. He was comfortable with the EIR, and he did not believe the case had been made to warrant recirculating the EIR. He noted that he was disappointed about the placement of the Miracle League field in the third phase, to be completed in 2016, which he believed was an excessively long time, given its purpose and the need for the field. He believed the 2016 date was inconsistent with the pace and amount of energy put into the plans thus far.

Vice President Kohlstrand agreed with Member Lynch's comments regarding the ball field. She wanted to maintain the relationship with Clif Bar and keep that project moving ahead; she also wanted the City to maintain its relationship with Catellus and Prologis. She did not have any issues with the revised promenade, but would like further information about how the project related to the water's edge. She believed that the loss of the warehouse was an unfortunate occurrence, and acknowledged that many people were concerned about that.

President Cook inquired whether the Board was at the point of making a decision about removing that part of the pier, as well as that part of the warehouse. She suggested that the approval be phased if that were the case. Mr. Thomas replied that the plan may be approved with direction that when the later phase was presented, that the future of the wharf be re-evaluated. He understood that demolition of wharf west of Clif Bar would not start until

Phase 3. He noted that this item would come back to the Board before demolition of that part of the wharf is planned, and added that it may be five or six years before that phase returns to the Planning Board.

Mr. Berry noted that the Board question had several pieces. First, has Catellus adequately analyzed the cost of the impacts from the wharf; he noted the answer was “yes.” They had shared their technical studies with the City, from the structural and geotechnical standpoints. They would be happy to share their construction cost estimates, and he added that they were working with Public Works and their outside consultant. They determined that the wharf deck should be pulled back. He added that with respect to the loss the warehouse, the existing DDA and DA gave them the ability to remove that warehouse, subject to further design review. He noted that they need to be able to move forward on a promenade plan at this meeting.

Mr. Berry noted that the Planning Board’s wishes regarding the Miracle League ball field had been made very clear, and that they had a Letter of Agreement with the Miracle League. He added that the Miracle League loved this site, and that they want them to use that site. He added that there was a carve-out in the development agreement that identified, in the event that interim utilities were available, that they could move forward in starting that project in that location without triggering the takedown of Phase 3. He noted that he met with their full Board three weeks ago, and he agreed that within 90 days of that meeting, he would return to their Board, if he received a determination from the City and utilities companies that there was existing infrastructure, with a proposal that they could provide adequate access. He then would approach the City to address how they could get the Miracle League to the site as early as possible. Within that 90-day window, he will have a full feasibility analysis performed by Catellus that would examine the opportunities on that site. If the first plan is not feasible, they also had a separate agreement that identifies the contribution of dollars to find another site for them. This site was the first choice for Miracle League, as well as Catellus; he assured the Board that Catellus had an ongoing commitment to work with Miracle League and City staff to find them a site as soon as possible.

In response to an inquiry by President Cook regarding handicapped accessibility, Ms. Altschuler replied that was part of the design and the reason for the long ramps.

Board member Mariani inquired whether the required demolition of the second warehouse was actually spelled out in the conditions. She noted that she was very disappointed in that requirement, and could not approve this item if it meant demolishing the second warehouse. Her enthusiasm for this project was rooted in the historic content and nature of this project, and the manner in which it embraced Alameda’s working waterfront, as well as the addition of Clif Bar and their intentions to preserve the area. She believed that language should be clearly outlined.

President Cook inquired whether a condition could be added so that before the demolition decision is made, or before the new office building was approved, that the situation be revisited. Mr. Thomas confirmed that this could be approved with the condition that when the Phase 3 buildings come back to the Board for development plan and design review,



before the warehouse is demolished and before the wharf is modified, that the plan provide the Board with additional and updated analysis of the feasibility of maintaining the warehouse, and retrofitting the wharf for the second warehouse. He noted that was a less expensive option than trying to do a retrofit.

In response to an inquiry by Member Lynch why that course should be taken, Mr. Thomas replied that it put into the record for the future date so that Catellus and City staff would be reminded that the community and the Planning Board wanted to save the warehouse.

Member Lynch wanted to ensure the wording was very precise so that the Board's intentions and expectations were clear to future staff and Board members. Mr. Thomas noted that Phase 3 contained a similar condition having to do with housing on the waterfront. He noted that if there was a way to return with a development plan for Phase 3 that included the second warehouse and extended the wharf for the second warehouse, it would be looked at favorably.

President Cook inquired whether the rail lines and movable benches in front of Clif Bar were still retained in the plan. Mr. Thomas replied that they most likely would have to be removed. President Cook added that she liked them, and was sorry to see them go.

President Cook was concerned about retaining the historic building, and believed that made the project richer historically. She was looking forward to seeing Clif Bar move into the site, and wanted to ensure the project continued to move forward. She was concerned about understanding the year-round usability of a floating dock of this size, as well as the cost of maintaining it. She noted that there was a shortage of docking capability in the Bay Area, and added that Chevy's in Alameda was now gone. She was concerned about what kind of plantings could be sustained on the rip-rap, as well as whether it could withstand the occasional tide coming over it.

President Cook expressed concern about the corner around Clif Bar, and whether bicycle riders would be safe from injury making that hard left turn. She inquired about fill credits from BCDC that could be gained when fill was removed. She would like the motion to include these considerations and concerns, if that was the will of the Board.

In response to an inquiry by Board member Mariani whether the second warehouse would be torn down even if the Planning Board did not approve the item, Member Lynch confirmed that was correct.

Member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that the recommendation page of the staff report had four bullet points, and inquired whether one resolution would approve all four bullet points. She further inquired how the language discussed by Mr. Thomas and Mr. Lynch relating to the potential demolition of the second warehouse would be incorporated into the resolution.

Mr. Thomas noted that page 3 of the resolution read, "Now therefore be it resolved that the Planning Board (a) adopts the first addendum; (b) approves the revised waterfront promenade. Condition 1: The prior construction of any portion of the waterfront promenade,

the applicant shall submit a design review application . . .” He suggested the addition of a second condition, reading, *“Prior to or concurrent with the submittal of the Phase 3 development plan for the office buildings or the waterfront promenade design review for the Phase 3 buildings, the applicant will provide an assessment of the feasibility of retaining all or a portion of the existing waterfront warehouse for an adaptive reuse.”*

The Planning Board generally concurred with that additional condition.

Mr. Thomas added that the later language read, “Now therefore be it further resolved that the Planning Board recommends the City Council approve the development agreement with the following revision: 4.9.2(b)...”

Member Ezzy Ashcraft would like that sentence to begin, “In the event that Clif Bar elects not to occupy the wharf building, and the building is demolished after creation of a reuse parcel ...”

Board member Mariani thanked the applicants for being creative with this project, and encouraged them to retain the historical character of this site.

Board member Mariani moved to adopt Planning Board Resolution No. 07-\_\_ to approve a Waterfront Development Plan amendment, a Master Landscape Plan amendment, and a Development Agreement amendment to revise the design of the proposed waterfront promenade and open space proposed as part of the Alameda Landing Project. The following condition will be added: “Prior to or concurrent with the submittal of the Phase 3 development plan for the office buildings or the waterfront promenade design review for the Phase 3 buildings, the applicant will provide an assessment of the feasibility of retaining all or a portion of the existing waterfront warehouse for an adaptive reuse.”

Mr. Berry wished to emphasize that the buildings were not historic. They were fully analyzed under the EIR, and the DDA allowed for the demolition. He believed the additional language would be acceptable, if language similar to that used in the retail center having to do with substantially similar requirements, or inconsistencies contained in the conditions of the approval on one hand, and for mitigation monitoring on the other hand, the development agreement and the DDA shall rule. He did not want to be put in a position of doing a feasibility analysis, where a DDA amendment would be required. He wished to clarify that the DDA was the controlling document, and requested assurances that the condition was not meant to conflict with the DDA.

Member Ezzy Ashcraft was concerned by the preface to Mr. Berry’s remarks with respect to the historical nature of the buildings. She understood that there was a specific definition of historical, and added that from the beginning of this project, the Planning Board had heard of adaptive reuse of the site. She noted that the Planning Board would like the developer to take their concerns into consideration moving forward.

Member Lynch inquired whether the DDA was the controlling document when there were conflicting conditions throughout the resolutions. Ms. Mooney replied that would

be the argument made by the developer. If there was a situation with a contract that has already been agreed to, two different parts of the same city would say different things, creating a conflict. At that point, the developer's argument will be that the provision in the development agreement was what they would be bound to, rather than the condition imposed by the Planning Board.

Mr. Thomas noted that staff understood Mr. Berry's statement that the development agreement would rule in this case, and that the City has allowed it. He added that an EIR was performed, and that these were not historic buildings. The City was essentially asking the applicant to think about this issue one more time upon their return, which may be up to 10 years.

Mr. Berry understood what the City was asking for, and he believed that would be possible.

Mr. Thomas noted that a third condition would be added, reading, "Where there are substantially similar requirements or inconsistencies containing the conditions of this approval, on the one hand, or the development agreement or disposition development agreement on the other hand, the provisions of the development agreement and disposition agreement and mitigation monitoring reporting program as applicable shall govern."

In response to an inquiry by Member Mariani why that condition should be added, Mr. Thomas replied that it was for clarity. Member Mariani responded that she could not make the motion if it included that condition.

Vice President Kohlstrand noted that she would be able to make the motion.

President Cook noted that the original motion should be withdrawn before a substitute motion may be made.

Vice President Kohlstrand moved to adopt Planning Board Resolution No. 07-\_\_ to approve a Waterfront Development Plan amendment, a Master Landscape Plan amendment, and a Development Agreement amendment to revise the design of the proposed waterfront promenade and open space proposed as part of the Alameda Landing Project. The following conditions will be added:

1. "Prior to or concurrent with the submittal of the Phase 3 development plan for the office buildings or the waterfront promenade design review for the Phase 3 buildings, the applicant will provide an assessment of the feasibility of retaining all or a portion of the existing waterfront warehouse for an adaptive reuse."
2. "Where there are substantially similar requirements or inconsistencies containing the conditions of this approval, on the one hand, or the development agreement or disposition development agreement on the other hand, the provisions of the development agreement and disposition agreement and mitigation monitoring reporting program as applicable shall govern."

Member Ezzy Ashcraft seconded the motion, with the following voice vote – 5. Noes: 1 (Mariani) Absent: 1 (Cunningham). The motion passed.

President Cook called for a recess.

9-A. **Alameda Landing Retail Project Applicant: Catellus Development Group, an affiliate of Palmtree Acquisitions Corporation.** The applicant requests Design Review approval for eight new retail buildings totaling approximately 250,000 square feet, off-street parking, and landscaping located south of Mitchell Avenue Extension and east of Fifth Street. The site is located along the western end of the former FISC Site (Tract 7884) within the M-X Mixed Use Planned Development Zoning District. (AT)

Mr. Thomas summarized the staff report. He noted that the June 25, 2007 resolution of approval for the shopping center, including all of the site plans conditions. He noted that staff only added conditions to the design review draft resolution that would be necessary relative to architecture and landscape. He noted that the draft resolution supplemented the approval of June 25, 2007 Planning Board resolution.

The public hearing was opened.

Mr. Chris Monahan, attorney for Mariner Square, Morgan Miller Blair, noted that they submitted a letter on September 21, 2007, stating their concerns regarding Catellus's design review application. The letter expressed the concern that the approval would adversely affect access to and from their site. They requested that the Planning Board delay the decision until they have had an opportunity to meet with Catellus and the City to discuss the access issues associated with Tinker Avenue. He noted that would be impacted by any decision at this time regarding the access and configuration of the Catellus. He requested that this item be continued to allow sufficient time to resolve these issues.

President Cook noted that five speaker slips had been received, and invited Board comment regarding speaker time.

Member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that the previous speaker had not taken the entire five minutes, and would like to allow the five-minute speaking time.

Mr. Christopher Buckley noted that he had submitted a letter to the Board. With respect to Building A, which he noted was a very large building at 55 feet tall and 660 feet wide, he suggested that on the parking lot side, an opportunity for additional differentiation on the upper level may help mitigate the overall size of the building. On the pedestrian level, he noted that there was a lot of blank wall areas between the entries to the storefront. He acknowledged that the rolling doors were necessary, and suggested that more glazing and display windows be added. He noted that the tiling was not called out on the plans, and believed that would add more pedestrian interest. He believed Building B was much more successful with the garden in the parking lot, breaking up the massing. He noted that the

backsides of the buildings facing Stargell and Mariner Square Loop, it was critical to avoid the “back of the building” look. When he looked at the plans, he had not been aware of the glazing plans, which seemed to be a promising solution to him. He believed that storefronts on the backside would add to the building’s presence, but may create functionality problems by the major arterials. He would like to see more glazing at the back, particularly on Building A. He noted that this was a very important project, and would like the colors and materials to be presented to the Planning Board at the final design review stage. He displayed images of a streetscape at the Victoria Plaza shopping center in Rancho Cucamonga, which was following a similar design scheme.

Mr. Richard Rutter submitted a speaker slip, but did not need to speak. He agreed with Mr. Buckley’s comments.

Mr. Bill Smith noted that sufficient earthquake standards in the site were very important, particularly on the landfill by the waterfront.

Ms. Karen Bay expressed concern about the large format of this site, and did not want it to become a big box development, rather than a lifestyle development. She envisioned mostly smaller specialty stores and one or two-format stores. She would like to see wording to define a lifestyle center.

President Cook noted that during the community process for this project, considerable work was done with the Webster Street businesses. They voiced their concerns about potential negative impacts of this project on Webster Street, and it was decided that this project should focus more on larger format stores so it did not compete directly with Webster Street. She shared Ms. Bay’s concern about the large format, but noted that this was the result of the community process in this case.

Member Mariani suggested that a continuance of this item based on the lateness of the hour and the potential extensiveness of the discussion.

In response to an inquiry by President Cook regarding the size of the businesses in the center, Mr. Thomas replied that there was a limit on the number of small-footprint stores, in order to limit the competition with Webster Street.

Member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that she generally agreed with the staff’s findings, but was not persuaded by some of the arguments regarding the sidewalk design. She noted that the staff report identified a detriment of moving the sidewalk to the other side of the street would result in the reduction of some parking spaces, and might encourage cut-through traffic between Stargell and Mitchell at higher speeds. She realized that while shoppers needed their cars to take their purchases home, she did not want to see people driving from one building to another within the center. She believed that several retailers could share the four spaces per 1,000 square feet that they were relying on. She would like to get away from the tendency to create asphalt jungles. She believed that with ground-up construction such as with this project, that the pedestrians, bicyclists and automobiles needed to be accommodated. She did not agree with the argument under “Design” on

page 8, that the proposed alternative of the second sidewalk created a physical and visual separation between Building A and the rest of the retail center. She noted that it was a sidewalk, not a wall. She noted that the sidewalk in front of the building did not create a visual separation. She was not willing to let go of the north/south sidewalk.

Member McNamara believed the different types of texture, particularly mixing metal with wood, would provide good variation. She encouraged more use of canvas or softer materials to soften the maritime effect. She believed there was an excessive amount of trees in the landscaping plan, and that when they matured, it would create a problem. She appreciated the use of the trees to create a neighborhood atmosphere in front of the Building A. She did not see where the ventilation units would be placed, and would like that to be addressed, because that would definitely affect the design of the building. Regarding the north/south sidewalk, she did not like the recommendation that was made to the Board. She noted that it was important to acknowledge the parking spot issue, and noted that some of the constraints and logistical issues at Towne Centre may warrant increased pedestrian traffic. She believed that without the use of sidewalks and the parking spots, pedestrian safety was placed at risk. She believed there should be an alternative traffic pattern to help with the overflow of traffic, and she did not see the traffic flow on Fifth Street as a detriment. She did not have a solution to the north/south sidewalk, and did not like the current recommendation.

Member Lynch noted that he had recently walked along the rear area of Santana Row, and noted that the subject site's back parking configuration was extremely similar. He noted that the configuration worked, and noted that if this site were to be as successful as Santana Row, it would attract enough people to make a significant difference to the General Fund. He complimented the applicant for listening to the Board's comments and integrating them into the design. He added that he had reservations regarding the configuration and sizing for the retail, but that decision has been made.

President Cook invited a motion to extend the meeting because of the lateness of the hour, and would like sufficient time to address the questions.

Vice President Kohlstrand moved to extend the meeting until 11:15 p.m.

Board member Lynch seconded the motion, with the following voice vote – 5. Absent: 2 (Cunningham, Mariani). The motion passed.

Vice President Kohlstrand expressed concern about the 67-foot height for a one-story building and the massing of the building for a non-functional reason. She would like the heights to be reduced considerably throughout the complex. She was also concerned about the frontage on Stargell and along Mariner Square Loop, and believed the proposed treatments along the large blank walls were very creative. She liked the historic scenes, as well as the vegetative walls and backlit glass. She noted that would be a very long frontage along Stargell with no doors or windows. She liked the pedestrian orientation of Fifth Street. She believed that one or two light towers would be sufficient, but that five would be too many. She believed there was additional site improvements to be done on

Stargell, which appeared to be one of the concerns raised by the Mariner Square management. She believed that the issues regarding the Stargell intersection and the north/south roadway needed to be resolved. She agreed with Members Ezzy Ashcraft and McNamara regarding the north/south roadway, and respectfully but strongly disagreed with staff's position and the findings that were made. She noted that most shopping centers were built with autos in mind, and were not built to accommodate pedestrians. She believed that something better could be done in that regard, and she was not willing to give that possibility up. She liked the design study, and believed it should be adopted and implemented.

President Cook shared the comments on the circulation system and liked the alternative plan, which she believed solved a lot of problems that have occurred at South Shore. She believed it was unsafe to cross the parking lot at South Shore, and would like to avoid that problem at this center. She appreciated the work that had been done to increase the variation of the façades, but was concerned with two of the large blank walls. She believed that the applicants could make Building A more visually interesting on the façade. She noted that the façade on Buildings B, E and G look quite large and blank, and suggested a landscaping solution. She was very concerned about the entrance roadways that are the entrance to Alameda Point. She was concerned that Building H on the corner had become very squared, which would not give people the impression of arriving in Alameda Point. She would like more attention to be given to all the entrances, including the Loop. She would like vegetation to be placed in front of the screens for the mechanical equipment. She wanted to ensure the historic billboards retained that historic character.

Mr. Thomas noted that the condition placed on the site plan in June was that the consolidated sign program would come back for City approval.

In response to an inquiry by President Cook whether Building A could accommodate two stories, Mr. Thomas replied that technically, it was feasible, but that Alameda Point was limited by the Master Plan cap of 300,000 square feet of retail.

The applicant's architect noted that in order to minimize all of the mechanical equipment, they raised the sides of the building and the parapets so they incorporate the mechanical screen, which would become part of the mass of the building. He believed that would be a nicer look, as opposed to having "hats" on top of the buildings. He noted that the tower element reached the 67-foot height, and that could be brought down. He noted that the lighting towers provided illumination for the parking lots, and reduction of the five towers to two towers would require the incorporation of parking lot standards, which would give the shopping center a more typical look instead of the more iconic towers.

President Cook noted that it was 11:15, and inquired where the Planning Board should go with respect to the rest of this item.

Mr. Thomas noted that the applicant would be going to City Council with the DDA and the DA amendments. He suggested passing a motion with the condition that they did the sidewalk, and inquired whether the Board would be comfortable conditioning some of the

design elements on the project, or to send the item back to staff for the final design review, taking the comments into consideration. He noted that continuing the item until October 22 was another option.

Member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that she liked the color palette, and supported breaking up the unarticulated side of Building B. She inquired whether the lighting fixtures on the buildings would come back to the Board. Mr. Thomas replied that it would not.

Vice President Kohlstrand moved to extend the meeting until 11:30 p.m.

Member McNamara seconded the motion, with the following voice vote – 4. Abstain – 1 (Lynch). Absent: 2 (Cunningham, Mariani). The motion passed.

Mr. Thomas noted that the extension of Stargell was a mitigation measure imposed upon this project, and that the Stargell project was approved by the City Council in 2001. He noted that it may not happen if the land from the College could not be acquired.

Vice President Kohlstrand believed the issues dealt more with the intersections at Mariner Square, as well as the alignment of the roadway and its entrance into the north/south roadway. She wanted to ensure that the Board would still have the opportunity to comment on and resolve the larger issues. Mr. Thomas noted that the issue before the Board at this meeting was the architecture at the retail center.

President Cook noted that she was comfortable with Fifth Street, and inquired whether the outstanding issues could come back while the resolved issues go forward. Mr. Thomas replied that it would be an option to approve the design review, with the condition that either specific elevations or specific buildings come back for design review. He added that staff would take the comments, and the Planning Director would work with the applicants to develop a revised plan for the elevation based on the comments. Another option was to bring the revisions back to the Planning Board for final approval.

In response to President Cook's concerns about the entrance to Alameda Point, Mr. Thomas replied that a condition could be added to bring back a street elevation for Stargell, Mitchell Moseley and Mariner Square Loop.

Vice President Kohlstrand moved to adopt Planning Board Resolution No. 07-\_\_ to approve a Design Review for eight new retail buildings totaling approximately 250,000 square feet, off-street parking, and landscaping located south of Mitchell Avenue Extension and east of Fifth Street. The following conditions would be added:

1. The condition of approval that the north-south driveway be amended to reflect the alternative study;
2. The condition about final design will be modified to state that the final elevations for the Mitchell Moseley, Stargell and Mariner Square Loop elevations will come back for the Planning Board's final approval;
3. Staff will work with the applicant to reduce the overall height of Building A.



Mr. Thomas noted that staff was concerned about the driveway and the access to Kathy Wagner's property, and that the condition should be modified to state that there should be mutual agreement on all the cross easements, indemnification, liabilities and the standard legal language, to be worked out to the mutual consent of the parties.

Mr. Thomas noted that Obaid Khan from the Public Works Department was in attendance, and would like to insert a reference to the MDIP.

Obaid Khan, Public Works Department, wished to address Condition 2 on page 3, which related to substantially similar requirements and inconsistencies. He noted that Public Works recommended including a reference to the Master Demolition, Infrastructure, Grading and Phasing Plan (MDIP). This plan would define the infrastructure grading and infrastructure plan.

Mr. Barry noted that they would probably go to Council on the sidewalk and north/south access. He believed the DDA already had the provisions for the protection of the MDIP; it contained a dispute resolution and opportunities for modification. He noted that if that condition was added, they would probably take that one to Council as well. He noted that they had come a long way on the design, and should be able to accommodate the Board's design comments, as well as bringing the elevations of the public streets back as well.

Mr. Thomas reviewed the proposed changes:

1. Reference to the MDIP, per Public Works;
2. Approve the alternative site plan (Page L-1-01)
3. The final design elevations for Mitchell Mosely, Stargell and Mariner Square Loop will return to the Planning Board for final approval once they have been worked out with the applicants;
4. Building A height and variation in the height will be included in the design returned to the Planning Board;
5. Strike the phrase in Condition 3 "provided that the property owner may elect to close the driveway";
6. Condition 4 will be modified with respect to the driveway and mutually agreeable insurance and cross-easements.

Mr. Thomas added that the vegetation on all screens would be double-checked.

Member McNamara seconded the motion, with the following voice vote – 1. Noes – 1 (Lynch). Absent: 2 (Cunningham, Mariani). The motion passed.

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS: None.

11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS:

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft wanted to ensure that the complete packets, including drawings, were being delivered to the main library and the two branch libraries.

- a. Oral Status Report regarding the Oakland/Chinatown Advisory Committee (Board Member Mariani).

Board member Mariani was not in attendance to present this report.

- b. Oral Status Report regarding the Transportation subcommittee (Vice President Kohlstrand).

Vice President Kohlstrand advised that there had been no meetings since her last report.

- c. Oral Status Report regarding the Alameda Climate Protection Task Force (Board Member Cunningham).

Board member Cunningham was not in attendance to present this report.

12. ADJOURNMENT: 11:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew Thomas, Secretary  
City Planning Board

This meeting was audio and video taped.